REMARKS

Claims 1-48 were originally presented in the original application filed on July 7, 2005. Claims 1-26 and 28-40 were Provisionally Elected in the response filed April 17, 2009. Claims 27 and 41-48 have been withdrawn in the response filed April 17, 2009. Claims 1-26 and 28-40 have been rejected in the Action dated August 4, 2009. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3-26, 28-34, and 36-40 is requested herein.

The Abstract in the specification is amended to remove the word "comprising" as objected to in the Action. The Abstract is further amended to remove element numbers as is customary in U.S. Patent practice. Numerous grammatical errors in the Abstract have also been corrected.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-12, 15-20, 22-25, 28-29, 34, 36-37, and 39 are amended to remove element numbers referenced in the claims as is customary in U.S. Patent practice.

Claim 1 is further amended to remove the wording "capable of"' as cited in the 35 USC § 112 rejection in the Action. Claim 34 is also similarly amended.

The dependencies of claims 3, 7, 8, and 36 are amended to due cancellation of an intermediate claim.

The dependencies of claims 5-6 and 21 are corrected to ensure proper antecedent for the zeolite and the hydrophobic material, respectively.

Claim 14 is amended to correct a minor grammatical error.

Claim Rejection based on 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 3-23, and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. The recitation in claims 1 and 34 of the phrase "capable of" was deemed to render the claims indefinite. In response to the rejection, claims 1 and 34 have been amended to remove the "capable of" phrase.

In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 34, it is respectfully requested that the 35 USC § 112 rejection of claims 1, 3-23 and 34-36 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and the claims be allowed.

Claim Rejection based on Duvinage et al.

Claims 1, 3-26, 28-34, and 36-40 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(e). The Examiner stated that these claims were not patentable in view of United States Patent No. 7,254,939, filed by Duvinage et al.

Duvinage et al. shows an exhaust gas purification system including a nitrogen oxide storage catalytic converter (5), an SCR catalyst (4), and a hydrogen unit (14). In contrast, Applicants' claims describe a NOX adsorber (18), an SCR catalyst (20), a off-line reformer (24), and a first oxidation catalyst (14) and a particulate filter (16). The first oxidation catalyst (14) and particulate filter (16) are disposed in-line, upstream of, and in fluid communication with the first NOX adsorber (18), as described in page 20, lines 14-19 and 29-31, and as shown in Figure 3. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a first oxidation catalyst and a particulate filter disposed in-line, upstream of, and in fluid communication with the first NOX adsorber, and therefore, does not disclose Applicants' invention as recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 1 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1. Applicants' claim 3 recites a system that further includes a second oxidation catalyst disposed in-line, downstream of, and in direct fluid communication with the selective catalytic reduction catalyst. The second oxidation catalyst includes a zeolite. These features are described on page 27, lines 15-25, and as shown in Figure 3. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a second oxidation catalyst disposed in-line, downstream of, and in direct fluid communication with the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 3. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 3 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3. Applicants' claim 4 recites the second oxidation catalyst including zeolite under-layer. The zeolite under-layer includes the zeolite and the zeolite under-layer is catalytic metal free, as described in on page 27, lines 23-26, and page 28, line 4. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the second oxidation catalyst that includes zeolite under-layer, where the zeolite is catalytic metal free, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 4. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 4 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4. Applicants' claim 5 recites that the zeolite is present in an amount greater than or equal to about 20 wt%, and is based on the total weight of the zeolite under-layer, as described in paragraph page 27, lines 23-26. Duvinage et al. does not disclose

that the zeolite is present in an amount greater than or equal to about 20 wt%, and is based on the total weight of the zeolite under-layer, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 5. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 5 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 4. Applicants' claim 6 recites that the zeolite has a Si/Al molar ratio of greater than or equal to about 12, as described on page 28, lines 19-22. Duvinage et al. does not disclose that the zeolite has a Si/Al molar ratio of greater than or equal to about 12, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 6. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 6 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 7 recites that the water gas shift catalyst is capable of maintaining, within about ±2 vol%, a hydrogen concentration in an exhaust stream passing through the particulate filter. The vol% is based upon a total volume of hydrogen entering the particulate filter compared to a total volume of hydrogen exiting the particulate filter. These features are described in on page 41, lines 7-12. Duvinage et al. does not disclose that the water gas shift catalyst is capable of maintaining, within about ±2 vol%, a hydrogen concentration in an exhaust stream passing through the particulate filter, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 7. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 7 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 8 recites that the water gas shift catalyst is capable of increasing a hydrogen concentration in an exhaust stream to greater than or equal to about 20 vol.%, based upon a total volume of the exhaust stream exiting the particulate filter, as described on page 41, lines 7-12. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the water gas shift catalyst is capable of increasing a hydrogen concentration in an exhaust stream to greater than or equal to about 20 vol.%, based upon a total volume of the exhaust stream exiting the particulate filter, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 8. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 8 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 9 recites a first oxidation catalyst and a particulate filter disposed in-line, upstream of and in fluid communication with the first NOX adsorber, wherein the first oxidation catalyst comprises an oxidation catalyst capable of partially oxidizing greater than or equal to about 60 vol.% of hydrocarbons, based upon a total amount of hydrocarbons in an exhaust stream entering the first oxidation catalyst, as described on page 40, lines 16-29, and as shown in Figure 3. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a first

oxidation catalyst and a particulate filter disposed in-line, upstream of and in fluid communication with the first NOX adsorber, wherein the first oxidation catalyst comprises an oxidation catalyst capable of partially oxidizing greater than or equal to about 60 vol.% of hydrocarbons, based upon a total amount of hydrocarbons in an exhaust stream entering the first oxidation catalyst, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 9. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 9 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 9. Applicants' claim 10 recites the oxidation catalyst is capable of partially oxidizing greater than or equal to about 75 vol% of the hydrocarbons, as described on page 40, lines 16-29, and as shown in Figure 3. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the oxidation catalyst is capable of partially oxidizing greater than or equal to about 75 vol% of the hydrocarbons, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 10. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 10 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10. Applicants' claim 11 recites the oxidation catalyst is capable of partially oxidizing greater than or equal to about 85 vol% of the hydrocarbons, as described on page 40, lines 16-29, and as shown in Figure 3. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the oxidation catalyst is capable of partially oxidizing greater than or equal to about 85 vol% of the hydrocarbons, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 11. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 11 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 12 is dependent on claim 9. Applicants' claim 12 recites the oxidation catalyst that includes a Part 1 and Part 2 component. The Part 1 component includes a Part 1 support material having an agglomeration of primary particles. An agglomeration size, measured along a major diameter, is about 5 micrometers to about 15 micrometers. The primary particle size is less than or equal to about 300 nanometers. The Part 2 component includes a primary particle size of less than or equal to about 500 nanometers. The Part 2 agglomerate size is less than or equal to about 0.5 micrometers. These features are described on page 12, lines 10-24. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a Part 1 and Part 2 component including support materials having an agglomeration size, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 12. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 12 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 12. Applicants' claim 13 recites the ratio of the Part 1 component to the Part 2 component is about 80:20 to about 20:80, as described on page 12, lines 25-31. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the ratio of the Part 1 component to the Part 2

component is about 80:20 to about 20:80, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 13. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 13 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 12. Applicants' claim 14 recites the Part 2 component includes a solid solution selected from the group consisting of titanium-zirconium oxide, yttrium-zirconium oxide, barium-zirconium oxide, lanthanum-titanium oxide and the like, as well as combinations comprising at least one of the foregoing, as described on page 14, lines 1-7. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the Part 2 component comprises a solid solution selected from the group consisting of titanium-zirconium oxide, yttrium-zirconium oxide, barium-zirconium oxide, lanthanum-titanium oxide and the like, as well as combinations comprising at least one of the foregoing, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 14. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 14 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 15 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 15 recites an in-line by-pass conduit capable of being disposed in fluid communication with the engine and the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and an in-line by-pass valve in fluid communication with the by-pass conduit and the first NOX adsorber, and the by-pass valve is capable of diverting an exhaust stream around the first NOX adsorber via the by-pass conduit to the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, as described on page 22, lines 28-30, and as shown in Figure 3. Duvinage et al. does not disclose an in-line by-pass conduit capable of being disposed in fluid communication with the engine and the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and an in-line by-pass valve in fluid communication with the by-pass conduit and the first NOX adsorber, and the by-pass valve is capable of diverting an exhaust stream around the first NOX adsorber via the by-pass conduit to the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 15. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 15 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 15. Applicants' claim 16 recites a second NOX adsorber disposed downstream of the by-pass valve and upstream of the selective catalytic reduction catalyst such that when the exhaust stream is diverted around the first NOX adsorber the exhaust stream passes through the second NOX adsorber prior to entering the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, as described on page 26, lines 30-31, and page 27, line 1, and as shown in Figure 4. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a second NOX adsorber disposed downstream of the by-pass valve and upstream of the selective catalytic reduction catalyst such that when the exhaust stream is diverted around the first NOX adsorber the exhaust stream passes through the

second NOX adsorber prior to entering the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 16. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 16 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 17 recites an off-line burner disposed upstream of and in fluid communication with the reformer and an off-line reactor in fluid communication with and disposed downstream of the reformer, and the reactor comprises an ammonia forming catalyst, as shown in Figure 5. Duvinage et al. does not disclose an off-line burner disposed upstream of and in fluid communication with the reformer and an off-line reactor in fluid communication with and disposed downstream of the reformer, and the reactor comprises an ammonia forming catalyst, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 17. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 17 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17. Applicants' claim 18 recites an off-line heat exchange device in thermal communication with a passenger compartment, wherein the heat exchange device is downstream of and in fluid communication with the burner, as shown in Figure 6. Duvinage et al. does not disclose an off-line heat exchange device in thermal communication with a passenger compartment, wherein the heat exchange device is downstream of and in fluid communication with the burner, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 18. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 18 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 19 recites the first NOX adsorber includes a catalyst capable of converting adsorbed NOX to ammonia, as described on page 17, lines 23-29. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the first NOX adsorber includes a catalyst capable of converting adsorbed NOX to ammonia, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 19. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 19 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 20 recites the first NOX adsorber includes a NOX trapping material and a sufficient amount of a hydrophobic material to render the NOX trapping material hydrophobic, as described on page 18, lines 6-19. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the first NOX adsorber includes a NOX trapping material and a sufficient amount of a hydrophobic material to render the NOX trapping material hydrophobic, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 20. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 20 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 21 is dependent on claim 20. Applicants' claim 21 recites that the hydrophobic material is present in an amount of about 0.1 wt% to about 2 wt%, based on a NOx combined weight, as described on page 18, lines 18-25. Duvinage et al. does not disclose that the hydrophobic material is present in an amount of about 0.1 wt% to about 2 wt%, based on a NOx combined weight, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 21. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 21 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 22 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 22 recites the reformer includes a hexaaluminate support, as described on page 25, lines 32-33, and page 26, line 1. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the reformer includes a hexaaluminate support, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 22. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 22 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 23 is dependent on claim 1. Applicants' claim 23 recites that the NOX adsorber comprises a substrate and a protective coating coated on the substrate, wherein the protective coating comprises phosphate, as described on page 16, lines 14-18. Duvinage et al. does not disclose that the NOX adsorber comprises a substrate and a protective coating coated on the substrate, wherein the protective coating comprises phosphate, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 23. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 23 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Applicants' claim 24 recites a method of NOX abatement. The method includes storing engine NOX from an exhaust stream in a initial NOX adsorber during a storage phase, forming reformate comprising primarily hydrogen and carbon monoxide in an off-line reformer during a regeneration phase, reacting the reformate with the stored NOX to produce greater than or equal to about 5,000 ppm ammonia during the regeneration phase, and storing the ammonia in a selective catalytic reduction catalyst during the regeneration phase, as described on page 21, and lines 26-31, and page 22, lines 1-4, and page 37, lines 5-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a method including storing engine NOX from an exhaust stream in a initial NOX adsorber during a storage phase, forming reformate comprising primarily hydrogen and carbon monoxide in an off-line reformer during a regeneration phase, reacting the reformate with the stored NOX to produce greater than or equal to about 5,000 ppm ammonia during the regeneration phase, and storing the ammonia in a selective catalytic reduction catalyst during the regeneration phase, and

therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 24. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 24 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 24. Applicants' method in claim 25 further recites by-passing the exhaust stream around the initial NOX adsorber during the regeneration phase, as described on page 21, lines 26-31, and page 22, lines 1-19. Duvinage et al. does not disclose by-passing the exhaust stream around the initial NOX adsorber during the regeneration phase, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 25. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 25 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 26 is dependent on claim 24. Applicants' claim 26 recites reacting NOX in the by-passed exhaust stream with the stored ammonia, as described on page 22, lines 28-31, and page 23, lines 1-4. Duvinage et al. does not disclose reacting NOX in the by-passed exhaust stream with the stored ammonia, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 26. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 26 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 28 is dependent on claim 24. Applicants' claim 28 recites reacting exhaust gas recirculation in the reformer to produce hydrogen, as described on page 30, lines 24-31. Duvinage et al. does not disclose reacting exhaust gas recirculation in the reformer to produce hydrogen, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 28. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 28 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 29 is dependent on claim 24. Applicants' claim 29 further includes filtering the exhaust stream and water gas shifting water in the exhaust stream in a filter to hydrogen prior to storing the engine NOX. The water gas shifted stream includes greater than or equal to about 20 vol% hydrogen exiting the filter, based upon a total volume of the exhaust stream exiting the filter. These features are describe in described on page 15, lines 6-31 and page 16, lines 1-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose includes filtering the exhaust stream and water gas shifting water in the exhaust stream in a filter to hydrogen prior to storing the engine NOX. The water gas shifted stream includes greater than or equal to about 20 vol% hydrogen exiting the filter, based upon a total volume of the exhaust stream exiting the filter, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 29. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 29 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 30 is dependent on claim 29. Applicants' claim 30 recites the water gas shifted stream comprises greater than or equal to about 26 vol% hydrogen exiting the filter, based upon

a total volume of the exhaust stream exiting the filter, as described on page 15, lines 6-31 and page 16, lines 1-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the water gas shifted stream comprises greater than or equal to about 26 vol% hydrogen exiting the filter, based upon a total volume of the exhaust stream exiting the filter, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 30. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 30 is not obvious to one skilled in the art..

Claim 31 is dependent on claim 24. Applicants' claim 31 recites further including partially oxidizing hydrocarbons in the exhaust stream prior to storing the engine NOX, wherein greater than or equal to about 60 vol.% of the hydrocarbons are partially oxidized, based upon a total volume of hydrocarbons in the exhaust stream prior to the partial oxidation, as described on page 15, lines 6-31 and page 16, lines 1-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose including partially oxidizing hydrocarbons in the exhaust stream prior to storing the engine NOX, wherein greater than or equal to about 60 vol.% of the hydrocarbons are partially oxidized, based upon a total volume of hydrocarbons in the exhaust stream prior to the partial oxidation, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 31. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 31 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 32 is dependent on claim 31. Applicants' claim 32 recites where greater than or equal to about 75 vol% of the hydrocarbons are partially oxidized, as described on on page 15, lines 6-31 and page 16, lines 1-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose here greater than or equal to about 75 vol% of the hydrocarbons are partially oxidized, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 32. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 32 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 33 is dependent on claim 32. Applicants' claim 33 recites where greater than or equal to about 85 vol% of the hydrocarbons are partially oxidized, as described on page 15, lines 6-31 and page 16, lines 1-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose greater than or equal to about 85 vol% of the hydrocarbons are partially oxidized, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 33. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 33 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Applicants' claim 34 recites a NOX abatement system that includes an in-line selective cayalytic reduction catalyst, an off-line reformer, an off-line reactor in fluid communication with and downstream of the reformer, and an off-line burner in fluid communication with and upstream of the reformer and the reactor, as shown in Figure 5. Duvinage et al. does not disclose includes an in-line selective cayalytic reduction catalyst, an off-line reformer, an off-line reactor

in fluid communication with and downstream of the reformer, and an off-line burner in fluid communication with and upstream of the reformer and the reactor, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 34. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 34 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 36 is dependent on claim 34. Applicants' claim 36 recites further including an off-line mixing chamber disposed upstream of the reactor, downstream of and in fluid communication with the reformer, and in direct fluid communication with the burner, as as shown in Figure 5. Duvinage et al. does not disclose recites further including an off-line mixing chamber disposed upstream of the reactor, downstream of and in fluid communication with the reformer, and in direct fluid communication with the burner, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 36. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 36 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Applicants' claim 37 recites a method that includes burning fuel off-line to form burner NOX, forming a reformate comprising primarily hydrogen and carbon monoxide, off-line, reacting the burner NOX with the reformate to form ammonia, off-line, storing the ammonia in an in-line selective catalytic reduction catalyst, introducing engine NOX to the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and reacting the engine NOX with the ammonia, as shown in Figures 5 and 6. Duvinage et al. does not disclose a method that includes a step of an off-line burner in fluid communication with and upstream of the reformer and the reactor, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 37. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 37 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 38 is dependent on claim 37. Applicants' claim 38 recites the burner NOX and the reformate are reacted at a temperature of about 120°C to about 400°C and a pressure of about 15 kPa to about 150 kPa, as described on page 34, lines 19-30. Duvinage et al. does not disclose the burner NOX and the reformate are reacted at a temperature of about 120°C to about 400°C and a pressure of about 15 kPa to about 150 kPa, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 38. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 38 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 39 is dependent on claim 37. Applicants' claim 39 recites further including periodically regenerating the selective reduction catalyst by periodically forming the ammonia and periodically introducing the ammonia to the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, as described on page 7, lines 3-8. Duvinage et al. does not disclose including periodically

regenerating the selective reduction catalyst by periodically forming the ammonia and periodically introducing the ammonia to the selective catalytic reduction catalyst, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 39. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 39 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 40 is dependent on claim 37. Applicants' claim 40 recites further including heating a passenger compartment of a vehicle with the burner NOX, as described on page 30, lines 24-29. Duvinage et al. does not disclose further heating a passenger compartment of a vehicle with the burner NOX, and therefore does not disclose Applicants' claim 40. Moreover, the substantive matter of claim 40 is not obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 1 includes a first oxidation catalyst and a particulate filter disposed in-line, upstream of and in fluid communication with the first NOX adsorber. The particulate filter includes a water gas shift catalyst.

Claims 3-23 depend on claim 1, and therefore are not taught by the references at least set forth in amended independent claim 1.

Claims 25-26, 28-33 depend on claim 24, and therefore are not taught by the references at least set forth in independent claim 24.

Claim 34 includes an off-line burner in fluid communication with and upstream of the reformer and the reactor.

Claim 36 depends on claim 34, and therefore are not taught by the references at least set forth in independent claim 36.

Claims 38-40 depend on claim 37, and therefore are not taught by the references at least set forth in independent claim 37.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 USC § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 3-26, 28-34, and 36-40 based on Duvinage et al. be reconsidered and withdrawn, and the claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed, in view of the amendments and remarks herein, that all grounds of rejection of the claims have been addressed and overcome, and that all claims are in condition for allowance. If it would further the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication and/or credit any overpayments to Delphi Technologies, Inc., Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas N. Twomey/

Thomas N. Twomey
Reg. No. 28,916
Delphi Technologies, Inc.
Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052
248.813.1200